



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,243	10/25/2004	Kiyotaka Uchimoto	4035-0169PUS1	8938
2252	7590	05/15/2008		
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			EXAMINER	
PO BOX 747			LUDWIG, MATTHEW J	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/15/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/500,243	Applicant(s) UCHIMOTO ET AL.
	Examiner MATTHEW J. LUDWIG	Art Unit 2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4-7 and 10-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 4-7, and 10-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the request for continued examination received 4/16/2008.
2. Claims 1, 4-7, and 10-15, are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims.
3. Claims 1, 4-7, and 10-15, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Micher, have been withdrawn pursuant to applicant's amendment. Furthermore, claim 5, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, have been withdrawn pursuant to applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. **Claims 1, 4-7, and 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Micher et al., USPN 7,177,797 filed (8/31/2000) in view of Onishi et al., USPN 6,154,720 filed (6/13/1996).**

In reference to independent claim 1, Micher teaches:

If a selection of the displayed word choice is made, namely a word or word chunk, it is received by a processor which determines whether or not a selected word choice is one with a

predetermined identifier (compare to "*an input step for inputting at least a word as a keyword through input means*"). See page 7, lines 45-67.

In response to receiving selection of the displayed word chunk, the system utilizes the word chunk in place of the input character for word prediction and is thus sent to the word prediction software for selection of word chunks (compare to "*extracting step for extracting at least one sentence or sentence fragment including one or more keywords from a database*"). See column 7, lines 45-67 and column 8, lines 1-67. The reference to Micher discloses a method what utilizes word chunks to enhance word prediction. At least one of selectable words and word chunks are displayed in response to receipt of an input character. Thereafter, a selection of a displayed word or word chunk is received, and in response to receiving selection of a displayed word chunk, selectable words including the selected word chunk are displayed. The reference fails to explicitly state a means of extracting sentences or sentence fragments for generating an optimum sentence. However, the reference to Onishi provides a means of entering a sentence which then automatically selects an optimal conversational sentence example and displays the sentence. See column 19, lines 1-67 and column 20, lines 1-31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Micher and Onishi before them at the time the invention was made, to modify the word chunk methods of Micher to include the known optimal sentence retrieval methods of Onishi because it would have given the user a means of freely entering and retrieving both word chunks, sentences, and sentence fragments to improve a user's understanding of languages.

If the words including the selected word chunk include other words including an additional identifier identifying a next word chunk, the system will display these new word

chunks up to what essentially is a second predetermined identifier (compare to “*text generation step for generating an optimum sentence based on the extracted text by text generation means*”). See column 8, lines 20-67.

The morphing functions are used to generate all possible morphs or inflection forms of the displayed and selected word. Stored morphing data, stored along with various ones of the words in a database is used to determine which morphing functions will be used (compare to “parser means morphologically analyzes and parses the extracted text to obtain a dependency structure of the text by determining the probability of dependency of the entire text”). See column 8, lines 40-67. Furthermore, Micher discloses morphing categories based upon nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. The morphing codes provide a proficient example of a dependency structure as presently claimed. The statistical technique would have been the methods for determining morphing codes and applying said techniques to analyze and words stored in a database and presented to a user. See column 11, lines 1-67 and column 12, lines 1-67.

In reference to dependent claim 4, Micher teaches:

If it is determined not to generate the first person singular form of the verb, the system proceeds where it is determined whether or not to generate the second person singular form of the verb based upon input data. If so, it is determined whether or not an irregular form of the verb is provided based upon information stored in the database. See column 17, lines 3-67.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Micher teaches:

The system utilizes the ‘imfs’, to derive the different morphs of various nouns, verbs, and adjectives accessed by a symbol sequence. This is done by making some icons dependent

icons which, when completing an icon sequence, allow for the morphing or creation of a morphed form of the main word. See page 19, lines 1-56.

In reference to dependent claim 6, Micher teaches:

A text characteristic pattern utilized through codes. The codes listed (column 12, lines 1-45) illustrate a characteristic text pattern for many different types of words. See column 12, lines 1-45.

In reference to dependent claim 13, Micher teaches:

Morphing categories based upon nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. The morphing codes provide a proficient example of a dependency structure as presently claimed. The statistical technique would have been the methods for determining morphing codes and applying said techniques to analyze and words stored in a database and presented to a user. See column 11, lines 1-67 and column 12, lines 1-67.

In reference to dependent claim 14, Micher teaches:

Morphing categories based upon nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. The morphing codes provide a proficient example of a dependency structure as presently claimed. The statistical technique would have been the methods for determining morphing codes and applying said techniques to analyze and words stored in a database and presented to a user. See column 11, lines 1-67 and column 12, lines 1-67.

In reference to claims 7, 10, 11, 12, and 15, the claims recite similar language found in the rejected claims, numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, and 14. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-7, 10-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2178

ML

Application/Control Number: 10/500,243
Art Unit: 2178

Page 7